

---

---

# MINUTES

## *California Postsecondary Education Commission*

Meeting of April 3, 2000

---

**Commissioners  
present** Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr., *Chair*  
Alan S. Arkatov, *Vice Chair*  
Carol Chandler  
Kyo "Paul" Jhin  
Monica Lozano  
Jeff Marston  
Roger Schrimp  
Kyhl Smeby  
Howard Welinsky

**Commissioner  
arriving after the  
call of the roll** Jacqueline A. Benjamin

**Commissioners  
absent** Darren Guerra  
Lance Izumi  
Velma Montoya  
Ralph Pesqueira  
Andrea L. Rich  
Melinda G. Wilson

---

**Call to order** Chair Rodriguez called the April 3 meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission to order at 9:14 a.m. in the Benvenuti Building, 1325 J Street, Room 1840, Sacramento, California. He asked for a call of the roll.

---

**Call of the roll** Judy Harder called the roll, with the following Commissioners present at that time: Chair Rodriguez, Vice Chair Arkatov, Chandler, Jhin, Lozano, Marston, Schrimp, Smeby, and Welinsky.

---

**Announcements/  
Welcome** Chair Rodriguez welcomed Commissioner Welinsky to his first meeting and announced that Velma Montoya had been selected to represent the University of California on the Commission. He said Commissioner Lozano had been selected to head the State Board of Education.

A motion was made to adopt the minutes of the Commission meeting of February 6 and 7, 2000. It was seconded and approved without dissent to adopt the minutes.

---

**Report of the  
Executive Director**

Chair Rodriguez asked Executive Director Warren Fox for his report. Director Fox introduced a number of new Commission staff and student assistants who were present in the audience, and reminded the commissioners they would be having lunch with the California State University and that CSU would also have a reception at the capitol that evening.

Director Fox said community college transfers to baccalaureate-degree granting institution is a key higher education issue in the state. He handed out some material and reported that the most recent trend was a reduction in the number of such transfers. He said that preparing students for transfer is but one of the missions established for the community colleges. However, he said that the majority of those students graduating from either UC or CSU are students who transferred to those four-year schools from the community colleges. He said the Legislature had provided some funding for outreach efforts to improve transfers. He said transfer students help to diversify the racial/ethnic makeup of both other public higher education systems. He reported that 10 community college campuses account for some 36 percent of the CSU transfers and about 23 percent of those at UC.

Commissioners commented on these data and discussed various issues that influence the student transfer experience. Among the points made were the following:

- \* The proximity of a community college to four-year institutions is likely affect whether students transfer and where
- \* That many students who are eligible to transfer do not do so and more must be learned as to why, and
- \* The community colleges have other education and training goals that may conflict with the transfer mission.

Commissioner Chandler expressed concern that more emphasis on student transfers may come at the expense of other programs, particularly those for vocational instruction.

Director Fox reviewed the Memorandums of Understanding on student transfer that exist between the community colleges and other systems. He also reviewed the goals of the community colleges' Partnership for Excellence program. He observed that the community college system would need to absorb the bulk of the Tidal Wave II enrollment demand over the decade.

Chair Rodriguez expressed concern for the students who want to transfer but who do not attend on the so-called top-ten community colleges. He also remarked that the number and variety of articulation agreements between community colleges and others appear to be problematic for many students.

Commission Marston said legislators are not clear on the problems associated with student transfers. Commissioner Chandler said more counselors are needed to explain and facilitate the transfer process. Commission Schrimp said economics and the need to work full- or part-time are issues for many students. Several commissioners joined in a general discussion about articulation agreements, Project ASSIST, and the use of technology in higher education.

Commissioner Arkatov inquired about the availability of articulation agreements. Commission staff member Kevin Woolfork discussed Project ASSIST and the information it makes available via a website. Commissioners Jhin and Benjamin discussed various aspects of marketing information about the student transfer process.

Chair Rodriguez said higher education should move on from the traditional model and employ more innovative means to deliver university-level instruction that is not place- and time-bound.

Other factors cited as impediments to student transfers included lack of information about transfer opportunities, and too few campus counselors for students. Director Fox passed out a Commission Factsheet on California Community College Student Transfers. Commissioners and staff discussed which Commission reports contain additional information about transfer outcomes and related information.

---

**Report of the  
Statutory  
Advisory  
Committee**

Chair Rodriguez called upon Statutory Advisory Committee Chair Juan Yniguez for his report.

Mr. Yniguez said the committee had met on March 2000 and he reported that Christopher Cabaldon is the new interim representative to the committee for the community colleges. He said the committee had a wide-ranging discussion on several important higher education issues, including the Commission's upcoming study on joint doctorates.

He also reviewed various issues, initiatives, and personnel changes among the systems. These included the release of the Little Hoover Commission study on the community colleges, a transfer agreement between the independent institutions and the community colleges, the Partnership for Excellence program, leadership institutes, and a University of California website that addresses Tidal Wave II issues.

---

**Presentation  
on the Proposed  
CSU Channel  
Island Campus**

Director Fox thanked the representatives from the California State University who had come to discuss the system's proposed 23<sup>rd</sup> campus, Channel Islands. He said that Commission staff has visited the proposed site and that State University personnel had spoken with staff about the proposal.

Among those making the presentation were Barbara Thorpe, Associate Academic Vice President for the proposed campus; George Dutra, Associate Vice President for Facilities Development and Operations; academic planners Ira Schoenwald and Ted Lucas; Frank Jewett, special consultant for Academic Affairs from the CSU

Chancellor's office; and Pat Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Capital Planning, Design, and Construction.

Ms. Thorpe reviewed the 30-year history of planning and financing for a campus at various sites in and around the Ventura and Santa Barbara county area. She reported that the campus is now on the site of the former Camarillo State Hospital and it now has 1,500 students from the CSU Northridge campus at the Channel Islands facility.

Chair Rodriguez asked whether consideration had been given to keeping the facility as an off-campus center rather than a full-fledged, stand-alone campus.

Ms. Thorpe cited the State Education Code support for an individual campus, the growing population in the area, and distances and travel times to other facilities such as the CSU Northridge campus. She said the proposed full-curriculum for the campus would be response to area work force needs in mathematics, computer science, and related areas of high technology. She said these are high-cost programs.

Ms. Thorpe said the proposed facility is quite large and that it will accommodate some 14,000 Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES) by 2010. She said local growth numbers in the service area support the establishment of the campus. She said many of the students would come from the area's growing Latino community.

Ms. Thorpe reported that the focus of the academic plan would be science, technology and teacher preparation. She said these would be responsive to area and state-wide needs for students with degrees in information technology, computer engineering, and biotechnology. She also reviewed details of the general education and other aspects of the academic program, and briefly outlined the campus outreach efforts in the local community.

Mr. Dutra reviewed state and community support for the campus and its support facilities such as transportation, and reviewed various grants and other community and State financial support for improving the facility. He outlined the development plans for faculty and student facilities. He said the campus master plan and other environmental assessments would be taken before the CSU Trustees for approval in July 2000. He detailed plans to make the facility a "green" campus that is environmentally sensitive to the area. Mr. Dutra said the next major project on the campus is to expand significantly the campus library facilities.

Ms. Thorpe went over the next steps in the planning process for the Channel Islands facility. These include:

- \* A \$10-million State Budget request in 2000-01 to start the campus, and an anticipated \$3-million State Budget request in 2000-02;
- \* A submission of the proposal's need analysis to the Commission on May 1, 2000, with an anticipated approval by fall 2000;
- \* Hiring of faculty and administrators; and
- \* Admission of the first students by the Fall Semester 2002.

Ms. Thorpe reviewed the initial personnel and equipment position numbers and costs. She thanked the Commission for the opportunity to make the presentation.

Commissioners, staff, and the CSU representatives had a wide-ranging discussion about recent campus development experiences, environmental issues, outreach activities, and facilities development.

Chair Rodriguez thanked the presenters.

<b>Recess</b>	Chair Rodriguez recessed the meeting at 10:50 a.m. in order to convene the Educational Policy and Programs Committee.
<b>Reconvene/Recess</b>	Chair Rodriguez reconvened the Commission meeting at 11:53 a.m. before recessing for lunch.
<b>Reconvene</b>	<p>Chair Rodriguez reconvened the meeting at 1:43 p.m. He thanked the California State University system for inviting commissioners to lunch. He noted that former commissioner Henry Der was present and thanked him for 12 years of service to the Commission. He presented Mr. Der with a resolution.</p> <p>Mr. Der thanked the Commission and noted that it had worked on many important issues in the past and that he was confident it would do so in the future as well. He said he looked forward to continued work with the Commission in his capacity as the Commission's representative on the federal Gear Up program.</p>
<b>Recess</b>	Chair Rodriguez recessed the meeting at 1:49 p.m. in order to reconvene the Educational Policy and Programs Committee.
<b>Reconvene/Recess</b>	Chair Rodriguez reconvened the meeting at 3:00 p.m. and recessed to convene the Governmental Relations Committee.
<b>Reconvene/ Meeting of the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee</b>	Chair Rodriguez reconvened the meeting at 3:16 p.m. He announced that, because the Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee lacked a quorum, the minutes from the February 7 meeting would be held over until the April meeting for consideration of approval. He said the Commission, as a whole would take up the two items scheduled previously to be heard by the committee.
<b>Faculty Salaries</b>	Chair Rodriguez called on staff member Kevin Woolfork to present a report on faculty salaries. Mr. Woolfork said the committee had previously heard this report on the faculty salary parity lag at the University of California and California State University as an information item. He said that, although staff had since received some additional information, the report remained substantially unchanged at 8.9 percent at CSU and 3.0 percent at UC. He said it was now being presented for action and approval.

Commissioner Welinsky asked why the report did not include the California Community Colleges. Staff member Karl Engelbach explained that the report was in response to supplemental report language that specified that the Commission report on faculty salaries at the University and CSU.

There was a general discussion concerning the unique character of the community colleges and various efforts to address related issues in that sector.

Chair Rodriguez asked for a motion to approve the report. A motion was so made, seconded, and passed without dissent.

---

**Report of the  
Governmental  
Relations  
Committee**

Chair Rodriguez called for a report from the Governmental Relations committee. Commissioner Marston reported on that meeting, including committee adoption of changes to some Commission positions on pending legislation. He made a motion for adoption by full Commission that was seconded and passed without dissent.

---

**Report of the  
Education Policy  
and Programs  
Committee**

Committee Chair Chandler reported that the committee had voted to approve the Commission report, *Policy for Progress: Reaffirming California Higher Education Accessibility, Affordability, and Accountability into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. She made a motion that the Commission also approve the report. It was seconded and passed without dissent

---

**Review of the  
Legislative  
Analyst's  
Recommendations  
on the  
Governmental  
Relations  
Committee**

Chair Rodriguez called upon staff members Beth Graybill and Kevin Woolfork to present this item.

Mr. Woolfork reviewed the State Budget process and the role of the Legislative Analyst in commenting on the Governor's Proposed Budget put forth each January. About a month later, the Analyst follows with comments and recommendations on the proposed budget document. For 2000-01, those comments include a:

- \* Concern about the multi-year partnership agreement proposed between the Office or the Governor and CSU and UC, asserting it undermines the credibility of the annual budget process; and
- \* A recommendation to delete \$61 million from the budgets of the California public colleges based on concerns about enrollment over-projections, and to redirect these and others funds (total \$149 million) to K-12 and the community colleges.

Beth Graybill added that the Analyst had also raised a concern, in reference to some of the Governor's education proposals, about a lack of local control to develop programs. The Analyst is also concerned that the definition of low-performing schools is overly broad and has issued a recommendation to redirect \$122.3 million into local block grants that would be targeted at the lowest performing schools. The Analyst also calls for \$149.3 million for teacher training block grants.

Chair Rodriguez said the Analyst's recommendations on redirecting higher education enrollment dollars to K-12 seemed to be pitting one level of public education

against the other. He said the Commission's concerns about funding postsecondary enrollment growth, tying funding to accountability and measured outcomes should be communicated to the Analyst's office. He said this would be helpful in convincing the Governor and Legislature that we need adequate funding to address enrollment demand.

---

**Adjournment**    Having no further business, the Commission adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

---